

From: Robert Morris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 11:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to oppose the currently proposed settlement of United States v. Microsoft. As a 10 year veteran of application development for the Intel platform, I have personal experience with the anticompetitive practices brought to light in the case, both blatant and subtle. After a careful reading of the proposed settlement, it is my conclusion that it does not meet the goal of preventing further anticompetitive practices by Microsoft.

I am in substantive agreement with the points raised by Dan Kegel (<http://www.kegel.com/remedy/letter.html>) and therefore will not repeat them here.

On a personal note, my company, despite not competing with any current or proposed Microsoft product, still faces integration and interoperability issues _constantly_ due to the current state of affairs, namely the exclusive binding of MS applications to and with the operating system. A simple example of this is that anyone whose office uses Microsoft Proxy to control access to the Internet cannot use our product, as the authentication method Microsoft has chosen is undocumented, and is changed with each new version to prevent Netscape and others such as ourselves from reverse-engineering it. Which in any sane world would cause MS Proxy to fail as a product. That it does not is due to it being bundled with the operating system, and working successfully with all Microsoft net-based applications. This situation is a clear case of anti-competitive behavior which will not be resolved by the current settlement proposal (as it excludes "security" API disclosures, and does nothing to prevent giving away integrated applications).

In short, while the proposed settlement is a step in the right direction, it will not prevent future monopolistic behavior, merely make it less visible and somewhat less egregious.

Regards,

Robert Morris
VP of Engineering
Eyetime Media, Inc.
Carrboro, NC
rob@eyetime.com

